



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/256,156 02/24/99 GILLIES

S LEX-003

021323 HM12/0517
TESTA, HURWITZ & THIBEAULT, LLP
HIGH STREET TOWER
125 HIGH STREET
BOSTON MA 02110

EXAMINER

MURPHY, J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1646

DATE MAILED:

05/17/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/256,156

Applicant(s)

GILLIES ET AL.

Examiner

Joseph F Murphy

Art Unit

1646

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-24, 26 and 27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-24 and 26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-13 and 27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Formal Matters

Claims 5 and 25 were cancelled, claims 1 and 2 were amended, and new claim 27 was added, in Paper No. 14, 2/28/2001. Claims 1-4, 6-24 and 26-27 are pending. Claims 14-24 and 26 stand withdrawn from consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b). Claims 1-4, 6-13 and 27 are under consideration.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U. S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office Action.

Response to Amendment

The objection to claim 25 has been rendered moot by cancellation of the claim, and is thus withdrawn.

The rejection of 5 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph has been rendered moot by cancellation of the claim, and is thus withdrawn.

The rejection of remaining claim 1 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph has been obviated by Applicant's amendment, and is thus withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112 first paragraph

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 2 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification as originally filed does not provide support for the invention as now claimed: an antibody-based fusion protein which has a longer circulating half-life in vivo than an antibody-based fusion protein comprising a portion of an IgG1 CH2 domain linked to said non-Ig protein.

Applicant's amendment, Paper No. 14, 2/28/2001, does not provide sufficient direction for the written description for the above mentioned limitations of claims 2 and 27. The specification originally discloses an antibody-based fusion protein with enhanced in vivo circulating half-life obtained by linking as least the CH2 domain of IgG2 or IgG4 to a second non-immunoglobulin protein (page 3, lines 25-27). The specification as filed does not provide a written description or set forth the metes and bounds of the phrase: an antibody-based fusion protein which has a longer circulating half-life in vivo than an antibody-based fusion protein comprising a portion of an IgG1 CH2 domain linked to said non-Ig protein. The specification does not provide direction for the instant antibody-based fusion protein encompassing the above-mentioned "limitations" as they are currently recited. The instant claims now recite limitations which were not clearly disclosed in the specification as-filed, and now change the scope of the instant disclosure as-filed. Such limitations recited in the present claims, which did not appear in the specification, as filed, introduce new concepts and violate the description requirement of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the response to this Office action

Alternatively, applicant is invited to provide sufficient written support for the "limitations" indicated above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1, 3, 6-9, 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hoogenboom et al. (1991), for reasons of record set forth in Paper No. 12, 8/29/2000.

Applicant argues that since the antibody fusion construct taught in Hoogenboom contains only 3 amino acids of the CH2 domain, it does not meet all the limitations of the instant claims. However, claim 1 reads "at least a portion of a CH2 domain". The three amino acids of the CH2 domain comprise a portion of a CH2 domain, and thus the claim limitations are met, and the claims anticipated.

Claims 1, 4, 7-8, 10-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by WO 97/30089, for reasons of record set forth in Paper No. 12, 8/29/2000.

Applicant argues that the antibody based fusion protein disclosed in '089 does not have a reduced binding affinity for Fc receptor. Applicant's attention is drawn to page 10, third paragraph which states that the IgG3-IL-2 fusion binds the FcγRI with slightly lower affinity than that of IgG3 alone. Thus, the rejection is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoogenboom et al. (1991), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,100,387, for reasons of record set forth in Paper No. 12, 8/29/2000, as applied to claim 2.

Applicant argues that neither the Hoogenboom reference nor the '387 patent teaches, suggests or motivates their combination to obtain the fusion protein of claim 27. However, the previous Office action set forth the teaching of Hoogenboom which is an antibody-TNF fusion construct, the human TNF gene is linked to the CH2 domain of the human gamma-1 chain. The '387 patent discloses the construction and expression of a chemokine-encoding fragment, a fragment containing a linker and part of the Fc portion of the IgG4 gene. The motivation is provided in U.S. Patent No. 6,100,387 (column 24, Table 2 and 3) which shows the success of these antibody-based fusion polypeptides to bind to receptors expressed by several human cell lines. Therefore, the Examiner has established that it would be prima facie obvious to one of skill in the art to combine the antibody-based chemokine fusion protein of Hoogenboom with an IgG4 CH2 domain as disclosed in the '387 patent, and the rejection is maintained.

Conclusion

No claim is allowed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Advisory Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph F. Murphy whose telephone number is 703-305-7245. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler can be reached on 703-308-6564. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3014 for regular communications and 703-308-0294 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0196.


Joseph F. Murphy, Ph. D.
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1646
May 14, 2001


PREMA MERTZ
PRIMARY EXAMINER